

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/849,809	05/04/2001	Mark W. Perlin	PERLIN-10	8918	
7590 09/02/2005			EXAMINER		
Ansel M. Schwartz			SMITH, CAROLYN L		
Attorney at Lav Suite 304	<b>v</b>		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
201 N. Craig Street			1631		
Pittsburgh, PA 15213			DATE MAILED: 09/02/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief					

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/849,809	PERLIN, MARK W.	0
Examiner	Art Unit	
Carolyn L. Smith	1631	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the	cover sheet with the co	rrespondence addr	9ss
THE REPLY FILED <u>18 August 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATI	ON IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the sam this application, applicant must timely file one of the following repli places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Ap (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with following time periods:	es: (1) an amendment, affi peal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evide compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or
a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of the final rej	ection.		•
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MON	, or (2) the date set forth in the f ITHS from the mailing date of t	the final rejection.	
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHI MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	ECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIR:	ST REPLY WAS FILED	WITHINTWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the p been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the correCFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory perio above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the nearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	sponding amount of the fee. T d for reply originally set in the fi	he appropriate extension inal Office action; or (2)	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance wi of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension t Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)),	to avoid dismissal o	f the appeal.
3. ☑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior	o the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	ecause
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideratio (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a correspon NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41 ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See at Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if the non-allowable claim(s).  7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	n and/or search (see NOT) or appeal by materially red ding number of finally reje .33(a)). ttached Notice of Non-Cor submitted in a separate, to the entered, or b) will	E below); ducing or simplifying ected claims. mpliant Amendment timely filed amendm	the issues for (PTOL-324).
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-4,8,9,11 and 12.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before of because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficier and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was	<u>all</u> rejections under appeal s not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ls to provide a l).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the s REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	atus of the claims after en	ntry is below or attac	hed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NO See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	T place the application in	condition for allowa	nce because:
<ul><li>12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB.</li><li>13. Other:</li></ul>	08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)	

## Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The added limitations in proposed amended claims 1 and 11 are new issues which would require further consideration and/or search. The "or higher" limitation in these amendments does not appear to have written suport in the passage referred to by Applicants as there is no mention of second, third, etc. dimensions. Therefore, "or higher" is considered to be NEW MATTER.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the presence of new issues and NEW MATTER in the proposed amendments. Applicants are reminded that the correct amending for deletion of claim language is via the use of double brackets, not single brackets. Because of the presence of new issues and NEW MATTER, the proposed amendments will not be entered. Therefore, all of the rejections in the previous FINAL action are maintained. If the proposed amendment had been entered, the 35 USC 112, 1st rejection and 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph rejection would have been removed. The proposed amended limitations would require new consideration of the current prior art for the 35 USC 102 and 103 rejections.

## Prior art rejections

Applicants argue that the amended limitations in proposed claims 1 and 11 distinguish the instant invention from the prior art. Further consideration of the prior art would be needed to make such determinations.

ARDIN H. MARSCHEL SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER